ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920010065US1   PATENT

Section II: REMARKS

It is respectfully requested that the changes as noted above in Section I be made to the present application.

In the above referenced Office Action, which was mailed on 5/6/2004, claims 1-2 and 6-16 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Yohanan. In the Office Action, Yohanan was identified as "(US 6,211,871)" and claim 5 was not included in the initial grouping on page 2 of the office Action although claim 5 was discussed in the first group on page 3 of the Office Action. Applicant believes that the Yohanan patent number should have been 6,072,491 (as listed in the cited references) .and that claim 5 should also have been included in this initial group. Applicant herein responds to the above-identified Office Actions using the above-noted corrections. Also, in the above-referenced Office Action, claim 17 was rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Bertram (US Patent 6,049,812), and claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yohanan in view of Bertram.

The above noted rejections are respectfully traversed. However, in order to further the prosecution of the present application, and without waiving any of applicant's rights to argue the allowability of the originally presented claims in a subsequent appeal or other proceeding in the event that the Examiner does not concur that the present amendment places the application in condition for allowance, applicant has herein amended and clarified the claims to place them in condition for allowance over the cited references.

It is noted that the present application includes claims 1-17 with claims 1, 9 and 17 being independent claims, and claims 2-8

Page 8 of 12

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920010065US1   PATENT

being ultimately dependent from claim 1 and claims 10-16 being
ultimately dependent from claim 9.

Independent claims 1, 9 and 17 have herein been amended to
clarify that, in accordance with the present invention, a copy of
a favorites file is displayed to a user together with a virtual
history file area on the display screen, and the user is enabled
to select from items in the favorites file and insert those
selected items into the displayed virtual history file, and the
newly created virtual history file is then inserted into the
browser history file so that the user can use the back and
forward arrows to move through the amended history file. This
methodology enables a user to avoid repeating a history path that
may include one or more sites which were not relevant to a
specific subject and, instead, move through the modified history
file which only includes files that were considered relevant to
the user and which were placed in order through the creation of
the virtual history file. By inserting the virtual history file
or listing into the browser history file, the user is enabled to
move through the customized history listing (which includes the
virtual history file created by the user) using only the back and
forward arrows on the browser.

Claims 7 and 15 have herein been cancelled with the substance of
those claims being included in one or more of the remaining
claims.

The Yohanan reference discloses a favorites list using icons but
does not disclose, teach or even suggest creating a virtual
history file from the favorites file and inserting the virtual
history file into the browser history file as disclosed and
claimed by the applicant. The system of Yohanan is unable to
achieve the beneficial results which are enabled by the present

Page 9 of 12

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920010065US1   PATENT

invention as set forth in the claims as herein amended.

Bertram provides a system that enables a browser to maintain
multiple concurrently active URLs. Bertram does not however
disclose, teach or even suggest displaying a copy of a favorites
list together with a virtual history file and enabling a user to
move items from the displayed favorites list to the displayed
virtual history list and inserting the virtual history file into
the browser history file as disclosed and claimed by the
applicant. The system of Bertram is also unable to achieve the
beneficial results which are enabled by the present invention as
set forth in the claims as herein amended.

Thus, since neither Yohanan nor Bertram discloses, teaches or
even suggests displaying a copy of a favorites list together with
a virtual history file and enabling a user to move items from the
displayed favorites list to the displayed virtual history list
and inserting the virtual history file into the browser history
file as disclosed and claimed by the applicant, it is believed
that independent claims 1 and 9, as herein amended, are allowable
under 35 USC 102(e) over Yohanan and that claim 17, as herein
amended, is allowable under 35 USC 102(e) over Bertram. Further,
since all of the remaining claims ultimately depend from and
include all of the limitations of one of the independent claims 1
or 9, in addition to even further limitations as set forth in the
individual dependent claims themselves, it is believed that
dependent claims 2, 6, 8-14 and 16 are also allowable under 35
USC 102(e) over Yohanan or Bertram.

With regard to the rejections of claims 3 and 4 under 35 USC
103(a) as being unpatentable over Yohanan in view of Bertram, it
is believed that, as hereinbefore noted, neither Yohanan nor
Bertram, nor even a combination of the two references, discloses

Page 10 of 12

or suggests displaying a copy of a favorites list together with a
virtual history file and enabling a user to move items from the
displayed favorites list to the displayed virtual history list
and inserting the virtual history file into the browser history
file, as recited in claims 3 and 4 through dependence from claims
2 and 1. There is no suggestion in either reference that it could
be combined with the other reference in any manner to render the
present invention obvious. Thus, it is believed that claims 3 and
4 are allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over Yohanan in view of
Bertram.

Claims 7 and 15 have herein been cancelled without prejudice.

It should be noted that applicant is claiming only that the **total
combination** of elements **and relationships** as recited in the
claims as herein amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered
obvious by the cited references individually or in combination.
Applicant is aware the individual elements of any claim can be
isolated, and, when standing alone, those elements can be found
in existing references. The similarity of various pieces and
parts of the references as noted on pages 2-6 of the above-
identified Office Action have been noted but it is believed that
there is no suggestion or nexus among the references to
anticipate or even suggest the total combination of elements and
relationships as recited in the claims as herein amended. Where
there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the references for
the **specific total combination** of elements **and relationships**
among those elements, as claimed by an applicant, it is submitted
to be inappropriate to search the prior art using applicant's own
disclosure as a recipe, to find piecemeal elements in prior art
references for individual claimed elements, and then to combine
those references in a manner, not shown or suggested by any of
the references, but rather as disclosed only by the applicant, in

Page 11 of 12

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920010065US1   PATENT

order to reject applicant's own claims.

Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-17, as herein
presented, are believed to be in condition for allowance, an
early notice of which is hereby requested. If any outstanding
issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for
expediting the allowance of this application, the Examiner is
invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number
indicated below. The Examiner's attention to this matter is
greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert V. Wilder

Robert V. Wilder (Tel: 512-246-8555)
Registration No. 26,352
Attorney for Applicants
4235 Kingsburg Drive
Round Rock, Texas 78681